

BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY KAIPARA DISTRICT COUNCIL

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Under the | Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) |
| In the matter | of Private Plan Change 85 (Mangawhai East) to the Kaipara District Plan |

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JAMES CRISPIN BLACKBURN

Coastal Hazards

23 January 2026



Warren Bangma
T: +64-9-358 2222
warren.bangma@simpsongrierson.com
Private Bag 92518 Auckland

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My full name is James Crispin Blackburn.

1.2 I prepared a statement of evidence dated 1 December 2025 on behalf of Kaipara District Council (**Council**) in relation to the application by Foundry Group Limited and Pro Land Matters Company (**Applicant**) for a private plan change to rezone land in Mangawhai East (**PPC85**). I refer to my qualifications and experience in my original statement of evidence and do not repeat them here.

1.3 Although this matter is not being heard by the Environment Court, I confirm that I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and I agree to comply with it.

1.4 I am authorised to make this statement on behalf of the Council.

2. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

2.1 Since I prepared my statement of evidence, the Government has made the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025 (**NPS-NH**). The NPS-NH came into effect on 15 January 2026.

2.2 The purpose of this supplementary statement is to provide an update to my evidence in chief in relation to the NPS-NH and how it impacts PPC85, specifically:

- (a) Management of risks associated with coastal flood hazard (inundation);
- (b) Management of risks associated with coastal erosion hazard; and
- (c) Management of Tsunami hazard.

2.3 I have considered the proposed mitigation measures against the relevant risks and have not considered the existing status of the land / development site without

implementation of the recommendations of the Applicant's Coastal Processes and Hazard Assessment.

3. COASTAL FLOOD HAZARDS

- 3.1** The baseline likelihood for inundation of any building platforms created in accordance with the recommendations of the Coastal Processes and Hazard Assessment Report prepared by Davis Coastal for Mangawhai East Private Plan Change dated June 2025 (Coastal Hazard Assessment), assessed in accordance with Table 1 of the NPS-NH is considered to be either “**unlikely**” or “**rare**”.
- 3.2** The basis of this likelihood assessment is that the design storm for coastal inundation is a 1% AEP with the sea-level rise prediction at SSP5-8.5¹ p83² (low confidence – 17% probability of exceedance), ignoring probability reduction associated with the Shared Socio-Economic Pathway (SSP) the probability likelihood is 0.17%. This addresses the consideration of climate change effects required by Policy 6 of the NPS-NH.
- 3.3** Any subsequent freeboard provisions (presently 0.5m in the KDC District Plan) further reduce the likelihood of inundation of habitable floors.
- 3.4** More specificity cannot be given since the limit of available data with confidence is to 2150.
- 3.5** The nature of coastal inundation at this threshold is such that the consequence of coastal inundation (NPS-NH Table 2), with the recommended modified ground levels in place, is considered “**minor**” to “**negligible**”. This categorisation is on the basis that coastal inundation here will be gradual, predictable for a severe event, and of shallow depth if it occurs.

¹ SSP 8.5 denotes the Shared Socio-economic Pathway climate response to a continued high-emission scenario in climate change modelling. It represents a future including continued and extended fossil fuel reliance, high economic growth, and heavy energy use, leading to significant warming and severe climate impacts, often seen as a plausible but challenging benchmark for extreme climate change effects like sea-level rise and extreme weather. In the context of this evidence it has been assumed that this pathway is certain (ie conservative – 100% probability of occurring).

² P83 represents 2 standard deviations from the mean prediction on a probabilistic distribution (83% inclusion), which by deduction leaves a 17% probability of exceedance.

- 3.6** Referencing Figure 1 of Appendix 1 of NPS-NH, the natural hazard risk associated with coastal inundation is **“low”**.

4. COASTAL EROSION HAZARD

- 4.1** Applying the Coastal Hazard Assessment from Davis Coastal, and the recommendations contained therein (setbacks), has identified a conservative threshold of 15m for erosion hazard facing the estuary (at a 100 year threshold) provides for a **“possible”** likelihood under Table 1. The erosion management zone limit at 30m proposed provides for **“unlikely”** for erosion likelihood of development land beyond the 30m buffer.

- 4.2** Similarly, the assessment of erosion risk for land upstream of the Black Swamp Road causeway identifies a 10m buffer as being suitable, which provides for a **“rare”** likelihood of occurrence.

- 4.3** For any development within the 30m and 10m erosion hazard overlay zones, the consequence is potentially **“moderate”** to **“major”** depending on provision of erosion mitigation work at the detailed development stage. The consequence is considered to be **“negligible”** for any development outside of these identified erosion hazard overlay zones.

- 4.4** The risk for erosion hazard using Figure 1 of the NPS-NH is therefore **“medium”** to **“high”** for any development within the erosion hazard overlay zone (without further mitigation).

- 4.5** Outside of the erosion hazard overlay zone, the risk assessed in accordance with the NPS-NH is considered to be **“low”**.

5. TSUNAMI HAZARD

- 5.1** Tsunami hazard has not been addressed in the Coastal Hazard Report by Davis Coastal. I have therefore considered the tsunami risk at the site based on the 2024

modelling and reporting by ORCAS (Oceanic Resilience and Coastal hazards Adaption Solutions) for NRC in 2024.

- 5.2** A portion of the proposed development land is indicated as being an inundation zone, extending up to 200m from the estuary shoreline. This line has been defined from modelling of a 500-year recurrence interval for existing ground levels. The proposed filling of the site will reduce the scale of the zone further, meaning that the triggering seismic event has an “**unlikely**” to “**rare**” probability of occurrence. Subject to the fill recommendations for the development site, with the provision of the tsunami warning network already in place in Northland, and which may require extending to include this new development land, the consequence level is considered to be “**moderate**” to “**minor**”. The risk level is therefore considered to be “**low**”.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1** Applying the NPS-NH, subject to the recommendations of the Coastal Hazard Assessment by Davis Coastal, the land identified for rezoning under PPC85 is considered **low** risk.
- 6.2** Development of land within the proposed Coastal Hazard Management Overlay is considered to remain **medium** to **high** risk under the NPS-NH, however I understand that the purpose of the overlay is to limit the ability to undertake development within this area.

James Blackburn

23 January 2026